

THE VANGUARD.

"We're beaten back in many a fray,
Yet newer strength we borrow,
And where the Vanguard camps to-day,
The rear shall rest tomorrow."

Vol. 4. No. 4. MILWAUKEE, WIS., JANUARY, 1906. Whole Number 36.

They own us, these task-masters of ours; they own our homes; they own our legislatures. We cannot escape from them. There is no redress. We are told we can defeat them at the ballot box. They own the ballot box. We are told that we must look to the courts for redress; they own the courts. We know them for what they are—ruffians in politics, ruffians in finance, ruffians in law, ruffians in trade, bribers, swindlers and tricksters. No outrage too great to daunt them, no petty larceny too small to shame them; despoiling a government treasury of a million of dollars, yet picking the pockets of a farm hand of the price of a loaf of bread. They swindle a nation of a hundred million and call it Finance; they levy a blackmail and call it Commerce; they corrupt a legislature and call it Politics; they bribe a judge and call it Law; they hire blacklegs to carry out their plans and call it Organization; they prostitute the honor of a state and call it Competition.

—FRANK NORRIS, in "The Octopus."

No ruler ever gave up the reins of power until he saw that they had really passed from his hands anyway. To rebel against the real authorities is never wise,—tho' many a ruler has not made the discovery in time.

Roosevelt, in his recent message to the congress, recognizes the real situation in this country, and expresses it in the following words: "* * these great corporations doing an interstate business occupy the position of subjects without a sovereign, neither any state government nor the national government having effective control over them." "Subjects without a sovereign" can only mean anarchy. What it is really meant to describe is the condition which actually prevails in

this country, in which these so-called "subjects" have really become the sovereign power, and are today constituting the actual governing power, "Subjects without a sovereign" is a contradiction in terms, and its real meaning for Roosevelt is that he, the chief executive of this nation is not the sovereign of these "subjects." This is sufficiently humiliating for the citizenship of the so-called "free" country, and that Roosevelt so understands it is shown in the following sentence, quoted from the paragraph just after the one from which the first sentence was taken: "* * all that I promise is to * * * prevent the commonwealth abdicating the power which it has always possessed."

Winfield R. Gaylord.

Our Social Classes.

In his annual message president Roosevelt says: "In the past the most direful among the influences which have brought about the downfall of republics has ever been the growth of the class spirit. . . . If such a spirit grows up in this republic it will ultimately prove fatal to us, as in the past it has proven fatal to every community in which it has become dominant."

There is undoubtedly danger to this or any nation in the growth of "class spirit" among people who, on the one hand, realize vaguely the injustice under which they suffer, but do not understand its causes or attempt to find the reasons therefor, and who, on the other hand, assume that their well-being is the result of their superiority, as the degradation of others is due to the latter's inferiority, all being in accordance with some so-called divine plan and hence exactly as it should be.

Social-Democrats are striving to substitute for a blind, unintelligent and unreasoning feeling of resentment against conditions which are seen and felt by every wage-worker, an intelligent understanding of the natural laws in accord with which society is developing. The Social-Democrat sees that mankind under its present system of organization is divided into two classes. He sees the reasons for that division and understands that it is not due to trivial causes which can be removed by tinkering with the tariff, by free silver coinage or any of the various political nostrums foisted upon a credulous people in order to distract their attention while they are being plundered. He sees what is responsible for this division of the people into two classes—the ex-

ploited and the exploiter—and understands what is needed to destroy this barrier and transform these two warring elements into one body of men, having identical interests and among whom there can be no "class struggle," because the cause for it no longer exists. Social-Democracy alone can prevent or is trying to prevent the growth of the "class spirit" which President Roosevelt inveighs against.

No evil can be successfully combatted by ignoring or misunderstanding it. If there is a foundation for this "class spirit" all the blandishments, sophistries and platitudes of capitalistic pulpit, press and politician cannot stop its growth. That the wageworkers and capitalists form two classes whose interests are opposed, is eloquently told by the history both of the past and of the present. The class struggle is a logical necessity of a competitive system. If labor is a commodity to be bought by the employer as is any other commodity, at the lowest possible price, as all capitalist political economists declare, it must, as in the case of other commodities, be to the interest of the laborer to sell his labor at as high a price as possible. Here is the dividing line between the two classes—the laborer striving to sell his labor for the highest price and the employer trying to buy that same labor as cheaply as possible. When employers associate in an attempt to compel their men to work shorter hours or accept higher wages, or when workmen organize unions and demand longer hours and less pay it will be possible to argue that there is no class struggle between wage-worker and employer, but not until then.

This "class struggle" must exist under a competitive system of so-

ciety. Capitalism insists that human advancement in every direction is the result of a self-seeking struggle with the object always of getting the best of the bargain. It is insisted that without this competitive contest, stagnation would result. From this point of view does not the struggle between wageworker and employer follow as a matter of necessity? Laborers, we are told by the capitalist philosophers, owe their skill to this competitive struggle between employer and employed, one seeking better labor for less cost and the other seeking the greatest return in wages for his efficiency as a worker? Those who contend there is no "class struggle" between wageworker and employer must abandon the competitive idea and all the theories based upon it.

When the President refers to historical evidences of the evil effects of the "class spirit," deplored so much by him, he manifests a total lack of appreciation of the true inwardness of the events to which he refers. Failure to recognize this "class spirit" and deal with it intelligently has caused the downfall of nations.

The only possible safeguard against a recurrence of such calamities is an understanding of the reason for the existence of this "class struggle" and the "class spirit" which it arouses, coupled with an intelligent endeavor to remove the causes therefor.

Social-Democrats recognize the existence of the class struggle—which is seen to be a part of the competitive system and hence must be admitted by those who uphold capitalism—they have a rational, philosophical explanation of the reason for its existence and they point the way for doing away with it by removing the cause. Social-

Democracy is, therefore, the only adequate protection against the evil which President Roosevelt deplores. His remedy is one that has been tried heretofore and has always failed.

—J. E. Harris.

The Modern Bandit.

"The modern criminal wears immaculate linen, carries a silk hat and a lighted cigar, and sins with a calm countenance and serene soul, leagues or months from the evil he causes. Upon his gentlemanly presence the eventual blood and tears do not obtrude themselves. Briber and boodler and grafter are often 'good men,' judged by the old standards. Among the chiefest sinners are now enrolled men who are pure and kind hearted, loving to their families, faithful to their friends and generous to the needy.

"How decent are the pale slayings of the quack, the adulterator and the purveyor of polluted waters compared with the red slayings of the bandit or assassin. What an abyss between the knife play of the brawler and the law-defying neglect to fence dangerous machinery in a mill, or to furnish cars with safety couplers. The providing of unsuspecting passengers with 'cork' life preservers secretly loaded with bars of iron, to make up for their deficiency in weight of cork, is only spiritually akin to the treachery of Joab. The current methods of annexing the property of others are characterized by an indirectness and refinement very grateful to the natural felings." —Prof. Ross, Nebraska University, in address at Chicago University.

The Socialists won six seats in the recent city election at Dresden, their first victories in that city.

An Anonymous Uprising.

By VICTOR L. BERGER.

THE Russian Revolution has developed a few peculiarities never before known in any uprising.

In the first place, the Russian uprising was a characteristically anonymous movement—a movement without any visible directors. There was not a single leader anywhere in Russia, nor scarcely one personage who came out prominently, since the day when the priest Gapon led a few thousand petitioners towards Tsarskoe Celo. Nowhere was there a great organizer or an eloquent orator, nor even a demagogue. Committees appeared, but they were anonymous. They never signed their names. In fact, no one knew whether they were committees of three or of three hundred. No one knew where they assembled nor what they did. Occasionally the police got hold of some men who were thought to be a committee of the revolutionists, but usually were a committee of a trade union. At any rate, a new committee, equally anonymous and equally insurrectionary, appeared in its place or rather — did not appear. It simply issued its proclamation, signed the “executive committee” or the “committee of committees.” These facts were pointed out with great glee by the Anarchist papers as showing the fallacy of the Social-Democratic theories of organization.

* * *

This anonymous character of the uprising was at the same time the source of a great deal of strength and of its downfall.

It was the source of strength, because the Russian movement was badly organized, and the Social-Democratic part of it, in particular, was very weak in numbers and discipline. According to the best authorities, there were never more than 8,000 Social-Democrats and so-called “revolutionary Socialists” in St. Petersburg, and this number included the members of the “Bund.” In Moscow the total number was even considerably less. Some claim that the Socialists and Revolutionists were comparatively better organized in Livonia, Courland and Finland. And this being the case, the anonymous character of the leadership, simply calling itself the “Executive Committee” or the “Committee of Committees,” without any name attached, not only shielded the leaders, but also concealed the weakness of the members.

A leader could have gathered around him, with all the Social-Democrats and the Social Revolutionists (Anarchists), only a small number. And this would have shown the nation and the bureaucracy how very few are the men who form the leaven for 140,000,000 Russians. A mere handful! They could easily have been blown assunder, had they stepped to the front.

Yet as a committee, a board, a group, their orders, demands and programs received attention because they expressed the hopes of the day, the wishes of all the dissatisfied. And the so-called intelligence of Russia, (doctors, professors, teachers, etc.,) were only too

glad to have some one else do for them what they were too cautious to do themselves.

The Russians, while decidedly gregarious by nature and great believers in the church, are nevertheless iconoclasts in politics. If Ivan Ivanowitch, Maxim Maximovitch or Abram Abramovski had appeared as the signers of a proclamation, the Russian common people would have asked "Who are those men? What do they have to say?" But signing as a "Committee of Committees" and speaking in bold revolutionary language, and moreover striking the popular chord, they were obeyed to a remarkable extent. Of course the workmen who were best organized, for instance, the railroad men and telegraphers, did not obey these commands, after their own demands had been granted, simply on account of the anonymous character of these proclamations.

Moreover, the brains of the revolution in Russia being largely Hebrew, had the names of the leaders been signed, they would have raised a prejudice against this leadership.

So much for the strength of the anonymous revolution.

* * *

But this nameless character of the uprising also proved to be the source of its weakness and its failure.

There was no Bebel, no Vollmar, no Jaures, no Vandervelde, no Turati, no Guesdes, to lead, to advise, to unite, to organize and—to be responsible for the results; responsible to his comrades, to himself, and to posterity. The uprising was very much like a snow drift, blown together by one wind, and blown apart by another.

This lack of responsibility was especially glaring in the case of the insurrection of Moscow. Many now claim that this was precipitated by the police, in order to get rid of the "Reds." Now the same thing was attempted by the police in Germany dozens of times. But the advice of the German leaders was invariably "Lasst euch nicht provozieren." Don't furnish targets for the machine guns. And the German comrades steadfastly obeyed their leaders. But if there had been no responsible leadership in Germany, there might have been many bloody outbreaks; and the chances are that the Social-Democracy would have been wiped out long before it reached its present commanding magnitude.

A very similar state of things occurred in Belgium in 1902. A general strike had been declared in order to do away with the plurality vote, and gain full franchise for the working people. When the army was called out, Vandervelde and the other leaders would not take the responsibility of a clash between the disarmed workers and the troops. The leaders declared the strike off, although it appeared to be a great defeat.

* * *

Not so the nameless committee of Moscow. They simply called upon the people for armed resistance, when the best arms at the disposal of the people were cheap revolvers and old shot-guns. They forgot or did not know that the time of the barricade has passed, as Frederick Engels has pointed out in his classic introduction to Marx's

"Civil war in France." Engels' well-considered views were again substantiated, we are grieved to say, by the butchery in Moscow, where over 2,500 members of the proletariat fell, to about nine soldiers and gendarmes. And any man who knew about the modern machine guns and the modern small calibre rifle of to-day, could have foretold the result. Probably German, French or American soldiers would have made even shorter and bloodier work of it. And yet that anonymous committee carelessly called for an "armed uprising" when it simply meant wholesale suicide. Leaders, if there had been any of note, would have considered this call twice, especially as there was nothing particular to gain by the uprising—the establishment of a Socialist republic being simply out of the question. Yet such anonymous calls to arms were actually repeated in some places even after the obvious failure in Moscow.

There is hardly any doubt that nameless and irresponsible leadership will never again be obeyed in Russia.

* * *

So the Russian movement had its bloody lesson and its slaughter of working people, as had the early English (Chartist), the French and the Belgian movements. The German proletariat fortunately escaped, thanks to its great organization. There can be no doubt that the Russian nation will have to pass through the same growth and follow the same path as the other white peoples of the world.

There is no short cut to the millenium.

In spite of what some enthusiasts at first believed, the Russian proletariat will have to organize, educate and work politically and socially for years, before they are able to become even a great factor in the International Socialist Revolution. They will have to build up a large, compact and well disciplined organization and develop strong and wise leadership. And possibly, they may even have to revise the Socialist theories to suit the necessities and emergencies of Russia.

But at the same time, while the Russian people, being unarmed, could not show how to fight, they have shown how to die. This of course lies in the Russian character, in which passive resistance plays the strongest part. And their heroism in that respect will furnish a brilliant example to all nations.

A Middle Class View.

The strike admittedly is a relic of barbarism. Still, even with the violence, bloodshed, and destruction which often attend, it is hard to prove that the laborer behaves *more improperly* than the capitalist.

So long as employers refuse to confer with their men, we shall have strikes. I believe, however, that the phenomena of such demonstrations

on the part of organized labor continually will become less and less.

I defend the sympathetic strike, the boycott, and the closed shop *ethically*, contending that labor monopoly is the only antidote for capitalistic monopoly.

The great problem which the future must face is a union of combined labor and combined capital against the consumers.—Prof. J. H. Gray, Northwestern University.

Civilizations Victims.

By ROBERT BLATCHFORD.

Robert Blatchford, the distinguished Social-Democratic editor and author of London, (Eng.) is writing a book entitled "Not Guilty, A Plea for the Bottom Dog," which deals in a humane and Socialistic way with heredity and environment and in defending the lowest victims of our capitalist civilization shows with what brutality we first produce and then torment and scourge that class.

THE case for the "bottom dog" should touch the public heart to the quick, for it affects the truth of our religions, the justice of our laws, and the destinies of our children.

Hitherto all the love, all the honors, all the applause of this world, and all the rewards of heaven, have been lavished on the fortunate and the strong; and the portion of the unfriended "bottom dog" in his adversity and weakness has been curses, blows, chains, the gallows, and everlasting damnation.



Robert Blatchford

I claim that men should not be classified as good and bad, but as fortunate and unfortunate; that they should be pitied, and not blamed; helped instead of being punished.

I claim that since we do not hold a man worthy of praise for being

beautiful nor of blame for being born ugly, neither should we hold him worthy of praise for being born vicious.

I base my claim upon the self-evident and undeniable fact that man has no part in the creation of his own nature.

Every man's character is formed partly by "heredity" (breed, or descent) and partly by "environment" (experience, or surroundings). That is to say his character depends partly upon the nature of his parents and partly upon the nature of his experience.

But, it may be objected, a man has power to change, or to conquer his environment; to train or to subdue his original nature.

That depends upon the strength of his original nature (which his ancestors handed down to him) and of his environment—which consists—largely, of the actions of his fellow creatures.

Briefly then, heredity makes, and environment modifies a man's nature. And both these forces are *outside* the man.

* * *

There are many who have some understanding of heredity and of environment when taken separately, who fail to realize their effects upon each other.

The common cause of the stumbling is easy to remove.

It is often said that two men are differently affected by the same en-

vironment, or what seems to be the same environment, and that therefore there must be some power in men to "overcome" their environment.

I have dealt with this argument already, showing that the contest between a man and his environment is really a contest between heredity and environment, and may be compared to the effort of a man to swim against a stream.

A given environment will affect two different men differently, because their heredity is different.

But remembering that we are born without any knowledge, and that we are born not with intellect nor conscience, but only with the rudiments of such, it must be insisted that the hereditary power to resist environment is very limited.

Let us take the case of two children. One has bad and one good heredity. One is a healthy baby born of moral stock. The other is a degenerate, born of immoral stock. We will call the healthy baby Dick and the degenerate baby Harry.

They are taken at birth into an environment of theft, drunkenness and vice. They are taught to lie, to steal and to drink. They never hear of any good; never see a good example.

Harry, the degenerate, will take to evil as a duck to water. Of that I think there is no question. But what of Dick the healthy baby?

Dick is born without knowledge. He is also born with undeveloped propensities. He will learn evil. His propensities will be trained to evil. How is he to "overcome his environment and become good?" He *cannot*. What will happen in Dick's case is that he will become a different kind of a criminal; a stronger and cleverer criminal than Harry.

But, I hear someone say, "we

know that children born of thieves and sots, and reared in bad surroundings, have turned out honest and sober men." And the inference is that they rose superior to their environment.

But that inference is erroneous. The *fact* is that these children were saved by some *good* environment, acting against the bad.

For there is hardly such a thing as an environment that is *all* bad. In the case of Dick and Harry we supposed an environment containing no good. But that was for the sake of illustration.

For the environment to be *all* bad the child must be prevented from ever seeing a good deed, or reading a good book, or meeting with a good man, woman or child.

Now, we can imagine no town, nor slum, in which a child should never hear nor see anything good. He is almost certain at some time or other to encounter good influences.

And these good influences will affect a healthy child more strongly than they will affect a degenerate, just as the evil influences will affect him less fatally than they will affect a degenerate. Because the poor degenerate is born with a bias towards disease or crime.

A good mother, a wise friend, a pure girl, an honest teacher, a noble book, may save a child from the bad part of his environment.

* * *

It would appear at first sight that two boys taught in the same school, by the same teacher, would have the same school environment. But at a second thought we find that need not be the case.

We know what one bad boy can do in a class, or a room. We may know then that the boys who share a class or a room with a bad boy have a worse environment than the boys who escape his evil influences.

It is a mistake to think of heredity

as all good, or all bad. It is mixed. We inherit, all of us, good and bad qualities.

It is a mistake to think of environment as all good or all bad. It is mixed. There are always good and bad influences around every one of us.

It is a mistake to think that any two men ever did or can have exactly the same environment.

It is as impossible for the environment of any two men to be identical, as for their heredity to be identical. As there are no two men exactly alike, so there are no two men whose experiences are exactly alike.

National or local ideals are part of our environment. We are born into these ideals as we are born into our climate, and few escape their rule.

The ideals of this nation are not good. To succeed, to make wealth, to win applause: these are not high ideals. To buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest; to make the nation the workshop of the world; to seize all rich and unprotected lands, and force their inhabitants into the empire; these are not great ideals.

But such national ideals are part of our environment, and tell against, or for, the development of our noblest human qualities.

A gospel of greed, vanity and empire does not tend to make a people modest, nor just, nor kindly. Indeed it is chiefly because of their greediness for commerce and wealth, and their ambition for empire, that the nations of to-day are armed and jealous rivals. And it is chiefly because of their hunger for wealth, and their worship of vain display and empty honor that the classes and the masses are hostile and divided. Ignorance again: they do not understand.

* * *

As the health affects the brain, and the brain the morals, all healthy and unhealthy influences have a moral bearing.

Bad air, bad water, bad drainage, bad ventilation, damp and dark streets and houses, dirtiness and overcrowding, all tell against the health, against the health of children most seriously, and all help on the deadly progress of degeneration.

Greyiness and monotony of life, unclean, unsightly and sordid surroundings, tedious and soulless toil, all tend to blunt the senses, to cloud the mind and oppress the spirit.

Millions of the working poor, who live in great and noisy cities, whose neighborhoods are vast huddled masses of sunless streets and airless courts, whose lives are divided between joyless labor and joyless leisure; the conditions of whose comfortless and crowded homes are such as make cleanliness, and decency, and self-respect well nigh impossible: millions of men, women, and children are here starved in soul as well as in body.

These people, throughout their anxious and laborious lives, sleep in the overcrowded cottages and tenements, ride in the overcrowded and inconvenient cars, sit in the crowded and stifling galleries at the theatre, are regaled with the crudest melodrama, the coarsest humor, the most vapid music. When they read they have the yellow press and the literature of crime.

They have no taste for anything higher? True. They have never been taught to know the highest. And their ignorance and their slums, and their clownish pleasures, are parts of their environment. We need not ask whether such environment makes for culture, for joy, for health.

They have no refinement in their lives, these poor working millions. They have no flowers, no trees, no fields, no streams, no books, no art, no healthy games.

Worse than that, perhaps, they are paid neither honor nor respect; they are without pride, and ambition; they have no ideals, no hope.

The environment that denies to human beings all pride, and honor and hope, all art and nature and beauty, does not make for health, nor for morality.

The straightness of means, the uncertainty of employment, the looming shadow of hunger and the workhouse, send some to suicide and some to crime, but leave the impress of their dreaded and evil presence upon the hearts and minds of nearly all.

The hunger for pleasure, for excitement and romance, is as strong in their souls as in ours. Like ourselves they cannot live by bread alone. Excitement, pleasure of some kind, they must have, will have. The hog is contented to snore in the sty, the cat is happy with food and a place before the fire; but the human being needs food for the soul as well as for the body. And there is ample

environment to feed the hunger of the ignorant and the poor for excitement: the environment of betting, and vice, and adulterated drink.

In the poor districts the drinking dens are planted thickly. There is money to be made. And they are blatant and frowsy places, and the drink is rubbish—or poison.

I have seen much of the poor. I could tell strange pathetic histories of the slums, the mines, the factories of the workhouse and the workhouse school, and the police courts where the poor are unfairly tried and unjustly punished.

* * *

I cannot quit the subject without telling an experience which hurt me like a wound. It was in a workhouse school: a school where master and matron did the best they could do for children so unfortunately placed.

"As we crossed a bridge from one building to another the master said something about a fish-pond, adding, 'We do not catch fish here, but we catch a good many mice.'

"'Have you many mice?' I asked.

"'Yes,' said he, with a peculiar smile; 'there is hardly one of our big boys but has a live mouse in his pocket.'

"'A live mouse? What for?'

"'Well,' said the master, 'human nature is human nature, and the little fellows want something to love. Some time ago the inspector cautioned a boy about putting his hand in his pocket, and ordered him to be still. The boy repeated the action, and as I guessed what was the cause, I called him out. He had a live mouse in his trousers pocket and was afraid of its climbing out and showing itself in school. He took it out on his hand. It was quite tame.'

"But still more touching was a curious demonstration of the infants as we crossed their playground. Released from the restraint of parade discipline, these little creatures, girls and boys between three and seven years of age, came crowding round us. They took hold of our hands, several of them taking each hand; they stroked our clothes, embraced our legs. Several of them seemed fascinated by my gold watchguard (it is rather loud), and wanted to kiss it. I gave one the watch to play with—my own children have often used it roughly—and his little eyes dilated

with admiration. They followed us right up to the barrier, and shook hands with us.

"'That,' said the master, 'is a peculiarity of all workhouse children. They will touch you. They will handle and kiss any glittering thing you have about you. It is because you are from the outside world.'

What an environment. It set me thinking of the stories I had read about savages crowding around white men who have landed on their shores.

"From the outside world": "something to love." In a country where some five millions a year are spent on fox hunting—such environment is forced upon an innocent and defenceless child.

One wonders as to the bum and the tramp, and the harlot and the sot: how are **they** brought up, and had they had anything to love?

Do you expect Congress to smash or curb the trusts? What an idea! The present government is a government of the people, by the trusts and for the trusts. Every United States Senator is a stockholder in one or more trusts. Will they vote to make their holdings less valuable? We guess not.

We do not condemn the trusts, but quite the contrary. The trust is a good thing with which we would not care to part.

The trusts save labor. We want labor saved. We don't want to do two days' work if the job can be accomplished in one. The trust saves competition. It saves waste. Therefore we want the trust.

THE TRUST IS A GOOD THING FOR THE MEN THAT OWN IT. It is an elegant thing for the man on the inside.

But you say "we don't own it, we are not on the inside."

That's easy. We can get on the inside

We can vote ourselves on the inside. We can vote to have the trusts made the property of all the people, and have them run for the benefit of the people.—*Ex.*

Industrial Survival of the Fittest.

"Straitson makes a specialty of his patent hay-rakes, does he not?" asked Odell.

"He makes nothing else."

"There's a lot of old patent rights among our papers, Mr. Dubble. Hunt up something that antedates his—that covers a hay-rake of some kind. Then sue him for infringement, and carry it up till you swamp him."

I gazed at him silently. He went on:

"It'll be an easy job. Straitson's at the critical point most young business men reach, where a fast-growing business, no matter how profitable, gets ahead of the capital. A heavy lawsuit will down him, and I take it that you're ready to throw in ten or twenty thousand."

I leaned back in my chair in bewilderment. In my efforts to develop the Lorsford Works, of which I now possessed almost the entire stock, I had tried to make a combination with Straitson. He was the owner of a factory at Hoppel Falls. Both of us were making hay-rakes, and if one of these machines were thrown out, and our energies confined to one style only, the machines could be built more economically, and saving effected in the distribution. But Straitson refused any proposition for combining, and declined a fair offer to sell out.

This called forth Odell's suggestion. He was secretary of the Lorsford Implement Works.

I argued with myself this way: "Economic progress has ever been pitiless in its sacrifices. The wishes of the few must give way to the welfare of the many." So I began to look for a patent to serve my purpose. The old proprietor of our

works had been rather careless in his purchase of such things. We found one upon which we could carry out our plan. It antedated Straitson's patent, and described some kind of a rake—not in any way similar to his. Still, our opinion was not evidence. The courts were established to decide.

So I commenced suit against Straitson for infringement, calling for an accounting of the profits. I got Tilson to go over to Hoppel Falls. He had a slight acquaintance with a man in Straitson's shipping room, and, by adroit management, obtained a list of the dealers who handled their goods..

This cost me a couple of hundred. Tilson said it did, but little dependence can be placed on men in such matters. However, it was worth that, and I caused circular letters to be addressed to all these customers, telling them that, as Straitson's rake was an infringement upon ours, we should look to them for royalties. This was only business.

This was a severe blow to Straitson, for dealers would not handle his goods excepting under guarantee against liability—and this was a heavy proposition for a man of limited resources. Furthermore, it headed him off from obtaining outside capital, if he attempted to.

But he put up a stubborn fight. We secured two of the keenest, shrewdest practitioners whom we could find, and, although we had no hope of gaining our suit, our men knew how to conduct it satisfactorily. At the trial they introduced every technical point which could be wrangled over, and took exceptions to the judges' rulings, thus piling up a mass of material

for an appeal. It was all very expensive, but Straitson had to meet as big a load while his bank-account was smaller than mine.

Months passed, and we were drifting toward the second trial, when the Hoppel Falls *Daily Item* stated that Straitson had disappeared—raised all the cash he could, and decamped.

It is an unfortunate ending to his career. He was a bright energetic young man.

The creditors went into court, the plant was sold and when I had secured the whole thing, and figured out the totals, I found that my law-costs had proved a very satisfactory investment. At last matters were in the shape I wanted

"Rainsford," said I to one of my stockholders, "I'll make these the biggest implement works in the country! I'll start up the Straitson plant at once, and with the two small shops here and our Lorsford plant, there is capacity for handling thirty-five hundred men."

"How about the capital, Dick?"

"I'll put in every drop of water the thing will hold!"

"These four plants have cost me \$900,000. I've been buying up patent rights and they are good things to call assets and write stock upon. It all foots up to nearly a million. Now, I propose to bring the four plants under one company, and capitalize at ten millions. I intend to show a dividend on that ten millions before offering one share to the public."

"Go ahead, and I'll stay with you!"

* * *

"I've secured a treasure, I believe in McGregor. He is superintendent for Straitson, and I consider him a more valuable acquisition than even the factory it-

self. He says: "'There's no man living and working in any capacity but can do a little more than he is doing?'"

"I don't know much about financing," said McGregor; "Give me a good gang, and a proper equipment and I'll give you all the profit there is in the goods—every cent!"

"I'm disposed to be liberal about the equipment," I said. "My intention is to consolidate all these factories into one big plant."

"That's putting your eggs all in one basket, Mr. Dubble," he remarked. "If you bunch your men together you can't handle them so well. They fraternize too much. Put your three Toonsville plants into one yard, and leave this alone. Then you can play one off against the other. Your Toonsville foundrymen are getting at least ten per cent. more than we've been paying here. Now, our foundry here has good capacity. As soon as we are in good order here, you put your Toonsville men up against a ten per cent. cut. They'll strike, and you at once send your patterns over here. We make the castings and ship them back. Then you give out information freely that you will move all your works over here. That'll put the tradespeople on your side and scare the rest of your hands. You can work this thing, so that, inside of a year, the Toonsville plant, as well as this will be an open shop."

I soon made up my mind that McGregor was right. I reorganized the four plants into one corporation, under the title of The Etna Implement Company—capital, ten millions; one million in six per cent. preferred stock, and nine millions common. A bonus of nine shares of common went with every share of preferred, and, as I had furnished almost the entire capital,

I took almost the entire stock in payment for my interests.

Then I began to act upon Mc Gregor's suggestion. A notice of twelve per cent. reduction to the foundrymen was posted at the Toonsville Works, followed by a howl of defiance from them—and they went out. I was ready for this and the same day shipped a car-load of patterns to Hoppel Falls. Mc Gregor jumped his men on to them at once, and was soon shipping back castings. I stood in well with our local papers—I always took care to do that—and they commented piteously on my announced intention to move. The loss of the three factories, employing together nearly three thousand hands, would be a grievous blow to our town.

Although some quit, the larger part stayed on. They were mostly old hands with families, and many had homes partly paid for. To them leaving this shop meant leaving the town, for I controlled the only employment open to them.

The beauties of McGregor's scheme developed as the months passed along. I closed up the two smaller plants at Toonsville. Then we reopened the foundry and hired any man that came along—union or non-union—and soon had an efficient force at the reduced rates. When the first year closed, both plants were open shops, and the scale of wages at Toonsville was brought down to as low a level as at Hoppel Falls.

One day Mac said to me:

"Those lumpers are getting too much, Mr. Dubble. We can drop them to twelve cents an hour. Every cent they get over a bare existence goes for drink. *We may as well have that as the rum-sellers.* I'll tackle the Falls plant first."

There were about three hundred of these laborers at that end—un-

skilled workers of course, many of them foreigners. They had no unions but when we posted our notice reducing the pay from sixteen to twelve cents, they went out in a body. Mac telegraphed an order to a Chicago agency for three hundred strike-breakers, and they arrived on a special train. There was some trouble at first—stone, and little matters like that—but we provided our new men with quarters in the grounds for a couple of weeks, and after that things went on quietly as before. Later, our Toonsville laborers gave in without a struggle.

I was looking over the balance-sheet with Odell at the end of the second year when Rainsford came in. I could not help showing my elation. "The regular profits are more than enough to pay the dividend on the preferred stock, and we've effected a saving on the payroll sufficient to pay five per cent. on the common."

It was not long before Mac saw something wrong.

"Mr. Dubble," he said, "there's something going on among the union men. They're getting the others into line."

"Is there no way of finding out what goes on at their meetings?"

"There is! One of the men has been detected in stealing brasses and some small tools—he's recording secretary of the union, and if you wait a little you'll see that he becomes *my* secretary also."

McGregor telephoned out to the mill, ordering the man, Coombs, to come to the office.

"Coombs," said the superintendent, in a harsh, resonant voice, "you've been stealing from the company! We've got brasses back from Cohn's junk-shop, and an officer's on the way to your house now with a search warrant."

The suddenness of the charge extinguished the trifling show of courage and self-respect the man possessed.

"Mr. McGregor," he gasped, throwing out his arms appealingly, "It wasn't but a little I took, an' I'll make it good, s'help me God, I will! I was hard up— awful hard up. The woman's been sick an' I couldn't make the wages meet nohow! There's been a doctor to pay, medicine to get, an' five children to look out for— an' all out o' *eight dollars a week!*"

He was looking now with terrified intensity into McGregor's eyes.

"Mr. Mc Gregor, I tell you my woman's bin sick— she's sick now—and it'll kill her if you send me up! I didn't think of doin' wrong—it seemed so little—and I needed the few dimes—Oh, God! how I needed them!"

"Yon're secretary of the union," he demanded, "you can go back to work, *if you obey my orders.*"

"Go back to work? Obey your orders?" He leaped to his feet, stammering out protestations of gratitude and docility, the tears starting from his eyes.

"Yon know where I live," the superintendent continued. "I shall expect to see you there to-night *with the records of the union.*"

The man stood speechless. The hunted, terrified look returned. "For the love of heaven, Mr. Mc Gregor, ask me something else! I dasn't do that! *I dasn't!* They'd *kill* me if they found it out! *I can't play traitor to them*—I'd as lief go to jail!"

"It's your choice," resorted Mc Gregor grimly. "If I don't see those records to-night you go to jail in the morning."

Coombs tottered to the door

Next morning Mc Gregor greeted me hastily: "They're signing a

good many of the non-union men, and they're figuring on all acting together. They are forming a Trade Council. They're in communication with the men at Hoppel Falls, and without doubt they'll act together."

"Sympathetic strikes, eh? Can't we buy the leaders, Mac?"

"Probably. I want to smash these fellows, and I don't want to stop production one hour. But I'll *never* run a union shop."

I was talking over the matter with Odell, when he remarked. "I expect Thorne is stirring them up. He's the congressional candidate on the new Labor ticket."

"He's an outrageous and libelous demagogue!" sputtered Rainsford, who had just entered the room. He was very red in the face, and he slammed a newspaper against the desk as he spoke. "Here's a full report of his speech at Lincoln Hall last night. Listen to this:"

"The Etna Implement Company requires an annual profit of \$500,000 to pay the dividend on its entire stock issue. Should they pay six per cent. only on the actual cash paid in, they would require but \$60,000, so that they are, in some way, earning \$440,000 more than the capital fairly and honestly calls for.

"Now this company, like thousands of others, is not a trust. It has no monopoly on its uroducts; it has to sell in open competition, and this large profit is not made by means of correspondingly high prices for its output, but is made by extorting from the wage-earners a large amount of work at smaller rates of pay. Some saving is no doubt made in thier expense account by reason of the consolidation, but the larger part of that \$440,000 is wrung from the men, who are compelled to work for lower wages than before any stock was issued.

"How is it earned? By what process is it stolen from you men? It's as plain as the sun in heaven. When McGregor took hold, the total payroll was about thirty-seven thousand dollars per week. Within a year it

was reduced to less than twenty-nine thousand dollars! That reduction paid a five per cent. dividend on the entire stock—stock which had been given away for absolutely nothing! In these works there are over five hundred laborers receiving but seven dollars and twenty cents a week—twelve cents an hour—men with families to support, cut down to this rate, in order that the shareholders should have ten times as much as is their due!”

“There, McGregor,” said Rainsford hotly. Our duty—to our stockholders and ourselves—imperatively demands that we stop this fellow at once. I’m told that he is carrying the workingmen with him in a solid body!”

McGregor gave a very palpable snort, and Rainsford wheeled on him sharply:

“I tell you, McGregor, you underate this matter entirely! Can you, for a moment, suppose that men will hear such incendiary talk as this and not do some thinking?”

“Mr. Rainsford,” said McGregor steadily, “I’ve been with workingmen all my life, and I know them. Those figures and statements come glibly enough from Thorne, but the men do not fit the facts together in their own minds. I’ll bet there are not ten per cent. of his hearers who could to-day, clearly and intelligibly repeat his arguments. By to-morrow they’ll be still more hazy, looking upon the whole thing as a bid for votes.”

“And he’ll get the workingman’s solid vote in this district!”

McGregor stepped forward, his eyes flashing: “There has never been any such thing as a solid Labor vote! It would be a keen and terribly effective tool if these fellows ever had sufficient sense to pick it up and use it—but they haven’t! The men stand together in the unions and butt against each other at the polls. They’ll starve themselves and their families in sympathetic strikes, and then slash each other on election day! Solid vote! Go into the shops or street and ask

the first dozen you meet how they’ll vote. You won’t find one who’s thinking of **his own affairs**, but they’re all slopping over for the good of the country. They’ve got all the big party slogans rippling off their tongues, because they sound important. ‘Free raw material’ is of more importance to them than **freedom from pinching economy**, ‘Home Trade’ abigger thing to talk about than **home comfort and sufficiency**. The iniquity of the ‘other party’ is more appalling to them than Thorne’s guff about the iniquity of the mortgages on their wages. The Panama Canal is more worthy to engage the Titanic intellects of these brawny sons of toil than the alimentary canals of their families! If they took up politics as they do their union matters, we might feel as though we ought to get busy, but there’s no fear of that—their leaders’ll head all that off!”

“Why?” The question was from Odell.

“Odell,” responded McGregor, “the ruption!”

union leaders well know that old style political discussion in the meeting will cause certain dissension and dis-

“Why can’t we make use of that condition?”

“You’ve got something back of that Odell,” said Rainsford eagerly.

“Suppose I found a man—active and influential in the union—who would introduce resolutions in their meetings to support Thorne in a body?”

“That’s a slashing good idea!” said Mac, after staring at the wall for a few moments. “A first rate idea—if you can get the right fellow!”

“I think I can,” asserted Odell. “I haven’t spoken to him yet, and don’t know his price. You all know Seldon?”

We nodded, and McGregor added: “Seldon would do if you can buy him. He’s been very active in their new Trades’ Council, and he’s got influence—lots of it!”

“He won’t overdo it?” inquired Rainsford anxiously—so well as to send this Thorne to Washington?”

“His contract would be to get these union fellows mixed up, and fighting for their various parties—I should have that thoroughly understood.”

Odell knew the bait to use for Seldon. The man had a chance to buy a partnership in a small sash and door factory, needed a thousand dollars, and Odell agreed to pay it.

Seldon proved to be clever and diplomatic. He first interested a few others in the idea of combining for Thorne, and, having thus sufficient backing, he introduced a motion in his own lodge to support the Labor party candidate in a body. There was strife, but he won out. Then the other lodges comprising the 'Trades' Council rebelled. As McGregor predicted, they were furious at the idea that any of the fellows should arrange anything about the way they should vote—should lay a finger in their precious franchise! In the mean time, Seldon had gone over to the Falls. He was in the matter heart and soul now—bound to win his reward. He showed the men there the decision of his lodge to vote as one man, and made several speeches, urging them to join in, but they jeered at him and declared they were independent voters finally threatening to run him out of town.

We got the local papers in both towns to comment on the matter in such a way as to exite still more bitterness among the men. I made an adroit move by contributing a hundred dollars to Thorne's campaign fund, stating in an open letter that I was in favor of legislation which would bring capital and labor into better relations. This was interpreted into an understanding between Thorne and myself—and he was suspected of treachery. Although there was strife and bitterness—much discussion and, I fear, much drinking. And through it all, McGregor, watchful and eager for every chance, discharged the leading union men, as he could make opportunities, leaving the rank and file still more demoralized.

Seldon got his thousand dollars. Apart from the service he had been to us, it was worth the money to get so strong and aggressive a man out of the Trades' Council. And, of course when he became a boss his views on labor matters changed.

Thorne's vote was cut to pieces. One of the old standard parties brought in their man—a safe man, "one," as Rainsford cheerfully said, "whose only knowledge of water was confined to the chaser which followed his whiskey."—Saturday Evening Post.

The year 1905 presents one of the worst blood-daubed pages of any in the recent history of civilization.

The Modern Work Girl.

One day I overheard a conversation between my boss and a girl employe. He was inquiring why another girl was not at her machine.

He was told that she was sick. "Where does she live?" he asked. The reply was that she boarded at a certain address.

"Does she not live at home?"

"No, she is an orphan."

"Then how does she live?"

I heard no more, but I went away with a little more positiveness added to my Socialist convictions.

What was behind that question: "How does she live?" The fact that the girl received in wages the sum of \$2 per week, and the man who paid her the paltry amount knew that upon it she could not live decently, honorably and respectably. The question showed that he understood the wrong that was done the girl, the temptation to which she was exposed.

Is he a bad man? No, not according to his lights. He is a pillar of his church, he carries the collection plate around on Sundays, singing as he walks.

Does he consider it a crime to pay a defenseless girl \$2 for a hard week's work? On the contrary he brags and boasts about it. He loves to show his visitors his wonderful machinery and explain to them how it enables him to dispense with the expensive "help," and use only what he calls "cheap, ordinary help." He considers it proof of his shrewdness, of his business ability, and no doubt he is right. He loves to drive a hard bargain, to buy something at a very low price, not solely because of the extra profit, but because it enables him to pat himself on the back and congratulate himself upon his smartness.

To him this thing which he calls "help" has no personal, no human side. To him it is only so much raw material to be bought for the lowest possible price. This "help" is less to him than his iron and steel machinery, for there is no such competition among the sellers of iron and steel machinery as there is among those who sell human flesh-and-blood machinery. The machines are patented, and he must buy them from one firm or not at all, while the human machines are everywhere.

To the capitalist the labor question is but an arithmetical problem. So much money for raw material, so much for labor, so much for machinery equals so much finished product which sells for a certain price, and the smaller the cost of either of those three items, raw material, machinery or labor, the greater is his profit.

Capitalist ethics do not require that the purchaser shall concern himself with the welfare of the seller whether it be iron, sugar, cattle, or labor power which is the subject of the bargain. To get it for the lowest figure possible is the only consideration.

There was a news item in the papers the other day which said that the Chicago drivers of the Standard Oil Co. asked for an increase in wages, and they asked the manager if he thought he could live on what they were getting. "No, I don't believe I could," he replied; "and probably you can't either, but the fact is *I can get plenty of teamsters who are willing to work for that pay.*"

Our capitalist paid two dollars for the girl, knowing that she could not live upon it, because \$2 is the market price for girls, and to give

more would be charity, and he does not mix business and charity.

No doubt if his church takes up a collection to provide funds for the "home for fallen women" he will contribute liberally.

There is but one thing that will end the wrong, and that is Socialism. Study it; work for it; join the Socialist party.—*Union Sentinel.*

Charles T. Yerkes, the get-there millionaire, who served a term in prison for using the city funds of Philadelphia, and afterward made a colossal fortune out of public service corporations in Chicago, left munificent bequests to New York City. *and now all is forgiven!*

The moral of this, dear childrun, is that you must never be a small thief, and if you are a big one be sure to make liberal presents and do public good with part of your thievings. Then you will be canonized by capitalism.

"What one Millionaire Has Done for His Home City," reads a heading in an illustrated Sunday paper.

We look closer and find that this millionaire became a millionaire by turning the people's forests into a private fortune and that he then took advantage of his strength thus acquired to plaster his city with his name carved in enduring stone over the portals of numerous institutions which he founded.

It was all a matter of business, of buying the homage of an easily fooled public.

The forests belonged by natural right to the people, and any wealth they yielded should have been public wealth, and the people able to put up their own institutions and with no private citizen's name vaingloriously sticking all over them.

Next Steps in Social Evolution.

Progress brings responsibilities. In the early days of the Socialist movement the question of "how are we to get there" was not particularly important. Our main energies were directed towards convincing the workers of the justice of our principles and the correctness of our philosophy. But with the advent of Socialists into the arena of practical politics, and with the election of many of our comrades to positions of public office, it becomes necessary to state more definitely our position regarding current political and industrial movements.

The Trust has been analyzed and examined and Socialists have everywhere come to the conclusion that, while the trust may temporarily increase the power of the capitalists in control, it finally makes for industrial progress, and that the transfer of business from private to public hands would never have become possible if the trust had not first systematized and consolidated manufacture and commerce, eliminating, to a large extent, warring business interests and antiquated methods.

The public ownership movement has within the last few years come to occupy the center of the stage as a live political issue. Does it come as a friend or a foe to the progress of Socialism. Should this movement meet with an encouragement or condemnation?

The answer to these questions seems to be far from unanimous within our party. Recently in a Socialist meeting the lecturer, who, by the way, edits a Socialist paper and is by many regarded as an authority on economics, claimed that this public ownership movement was a most dangerous thing, that it would con-

solidate capitalist rule and perpetuate the reign of the privileged class for many years to come. Is this view in accord with the facts? Let us examine the situation for a few moments.

What are the respective aims of Socialism and of public ownership? The latter means the ownership and, presumably, the operation of an industry by a community under the existing political machinery.

Social-Democracy stands for the ownership and democratic management by the workers of all the essential industrial institutions of the nation. Public ownership, as practiced in Glasgow and other European cities, contains the first part of the Socialist proposition, ownership by the community, but fails to include the latter part, democratic administration by the workers in their interest.

The exploitation of labor, the squeezing of surplus value out of the bone and sinew of the worker, may be performed just as mercilessly by a public as by a private corporation. Wherein, then, lies the advantage of public ownership or private enterprise?

In the first place public ownership means in its ultimate the control of industry by the majority of the voters, and if such industry is not operated in the interest of the workers themselves who constitute a majority of the voters, the means of redress is entirely in their own hands.

Again, in the operation of a public utility by the state or the municipality, profit-making, the Alpha and Omega of capitalist production, is subordinated to an effort to supply the needs of the community. This is the opening wedge which

ultimately widens into the Socialist ideal "Production for use and not for profit."

Glasgow, supplying her citizens with water, at rates which pay no profit to the community, but purely as an hygienic necessity, is an example in point. In this connection it is well to remember that no matter how trustified or consolidated an industry may become, so long as it remains private property, its bondholders and shareholders alone have the legal right to control. If the working class should conquer the powers of government and decide to socialize these industries on terms not agreeable to their owners, how are the people to gain possession? What is to prevent the trust magnates from organizing and drilling their employees to forcibly hold their property against the state? The employees of the railways, the Standard Oil, the Sugar, the Beef and kindred monopolies probably exceed in numbers any force which the people's government could master. But if these monopolies should have previously come under control of the government, even the present capitalist government, all officials and employees, from the highest to the lowest, are responsible only to the political party that happens to be in power. Capitalist interests are represented only by bondholders. Should the people decide that the bondholder is a useless appendage to socialized industry and repudiate the interest on his bonds, what redress has he? His numerical weakness prevents him from recapturing the public powers and the employees of the public institutions owe him no allegiance and have no interest in his fate. He can do nothing but submit to the popular will.

Thus it will be seen that every enterprise that passes from the pri-

vate to the public domain strengthens the power of democracy and gives assurance of a practical transition from capitalist rule to industrial freedom.

Let us glance at the modifications that have already taken place under capitalism:

First stage of capitalist development.	{ Ownership of industries and personal management by individual capitalists. (The Firm.)
Second stage.	{ Ownership by capitalists and management by salaried directors and officials. (The Company and Trust.)
Third stage.	{ Ownership by the community, management by popular government, indirectly controlled (through politicians) by capitalists. (Public ownership.)

In the last stage of development the capitalists become parasites pure and simple. In the Trust its shareholders appoint directors, whose duty it is to see that some one else manages the business. Public ownership removes even this last apology for a job. The people elect the business directors.

Just one more modification—let the workers assert their right to control and direct the industries in their own interest, and you have Socialism.

It may be asked why it is necessary to adopt this roundabout and indirect method of attaining Socialism when confiscation by the people would be so easy and simple. The answer is that economic evolution is the result of natural law in

operation and cannot be made to order to suit the wishes of any individual or political party. The same methods of progress which by small and constant modification have produced those striking changes that have revolutionized the organic world operate to transform the social structure.

The class struggle will not disappear because the government finds it expedient to operate a few industries. On the contrary the issues will be more clearly set forth and the alignment of forces more complete than any that can take place while private individuals control. The interest of the proletariat, who desires to operate the public services exclusively in his own behalf, will clash at every point with the interest of the absentee bondholder, to whom state ownership offers additional security for his invested wealth, and with the interest of the large property owner, who looks to *profitable* public ownership as a scheme by which his taxes may be reduced to a vanishing point. There can be no compromise between these irreconcilable interests.

It has been argued that government ownership in Russia and Germany has brought no advantage to the workers. This is probably true, for public ownership can only be of advantage to the people when they wield the political power. Democracy, or rule by the people, is absolutely essential. The people can only derive benefits in proportion as they exercise political power.

The municipal reforms as advocated by Socialists differ considerably from the municipal program put forward by middle-class parties. The latter are deeply interested in municipal telephones, lighting, transportation and other matters that will facilitate their business in-

terests. The Socialist demands municipal hospitals, medical attendance, bakeries, wash-houses, maintenance of school children and such other public service as shall be in the especial interest of the working class. He wants an increase of wages, reduction in the hours of labor, and all around better conditions of employment, which can only be secured at the expense of the profit-grinding parasites. So the conflict increases rather than diminishes.

In conclusion public ownership will supply those representatives of the working class who are elected to office under the present regime with an opportunity to obtain that experience and administrative ability in public affairs that will be so urgently needed when the workers have thrown off the yoke of capitalist control and shall undertake to guide the destiny of the race through the stormy portals of the Social Revolution. Then knowledge and experience, not noise or fanaticism, will be recognized as the saviors of humanity.

Ernest Burns.

Vancouver, B. C.

Premier Seddon, of New Zealand, who has gained a world-wide reputation for his inauguration of labor and Socialistic legislation, was returned to power in the recent general election. Seddon will have 57 members in Parliament against 13 for the opposition. The Prohibitionists fought hard but were wiped out.

Two hundred thousand of our fellow American citizens ate the debasing bread of charity in New York City Dec. 25, on the anniversary of the birth of Jesus Christ, who advocated a condition "on earth as it is in heaven."

SOCIALIST PLATFORM.

Adopted by the National Convention of the Socialist Party,
Chicago, May 5, 1904.

I.

WE, the Socialist Party, in convention assembled, make our appeal to the American people as the defender and preserver of the idea of liberty and self-government, in which the nation was born; as the only political movement standing for the program and principles by which the liberty of the individual may become a fact; as the only political organization that is democratic, and that has for its purpose the democratizing of the whole society.

To this idea of liberty the Republican and Democratic parties are alike false. They alike struggle for power to maintain and profit by an industrial system which can be preserved only by the complete overthrow of such liberties as we already have, and by the still further enslavement and degradation of labor.

Our American institutions came into the world in the name of freedom. They have been seized upon by the capitalist class as the means of rooting out the idea of freedom from among the people. Our state and national legislatures have become the mere agencies of great propertied interests. These interests control the appointments and decisions of the judges of our courts. They have come into what is practically a private ownership of all the functions and forces of government. They are using these to betray and conquer foreign and weaker peoples, in order to establish new markets for the surplus goods which the people make, but are too poor to buy. They are gradually so invading and restricting the right of suffrage as to take unawares the right of the worker to a vote or a voice in public affairs. By enacting new and misinterpreting old laws, they are preparing to attack the liberty of the individual even to speak or think for himself or for the common good.

By controlling all the sources of social revenue, the possessing class is able to silence what might be the voice of protest against the passing of liberty and the coming of tyranny. It completely controls the university and public school, the pulpit and the press, the arts and literatures. By making these economically dependent upon itself, it has brought all the forms of public teaching into servile submission to its own interests.

Our political institutions are also being used as the destroyers of that individual property upon which all liberty and opportunity depend. The promise of economic independence to each man was one of the faiths in which our institutions were founded. But under the guise of defending private property, capitalism is using our political institutions to make it impossible for the vast majority of human beings to ever become possessors of private property in the means of life.

Capitalism is the enemy and destroyer of essential private property. Its development is through the legalized confiscation of all that the labor of the working

class produces, above its subsistence-wage. The private ownership of the means of employment grounds society in an economic slavery which renders intellectual and political tyranny inevitable.

Socialism comes to so organize industry and society that every individual shall be secure in that private property in the means of life upon which his liberty of being, thought and action depend. It comes to rescue the people from the fast increasing and successful assault of capitalism upon the liberty of the individual.

II.

As an American Socialist Party, we pledge our fidelity to the principles of international socialism, as embodied in the united thought and action of the socialists of all nations. In the industrial development already accomplished, the interests of the world's workers are separated by no national boundaries. The condition of the most exploited and oppressed workers, in the most remote places of the earth, inevitably tends to drag down all the workers of the world to the same level. The tendency of the competitive wage system is to make labor's lowest condition the measure or rule of its universal condition. Industry and finance are no longer national but international, both in organization and results. The chief significance of national boundaries, and of the so-called patriotisms which the ruling class of each nation is seeking to revive, is the power which these give to capitalists to keep the workers of the world from uniting, and to throw them against each other in the struggles of contending capitalists for the control of the yet unexploited markets of the world, or the remaining sources of profit.

The socialist movement therefore is a world-movement. It knows of no conflicts of interest between the workers of one nation and the workers of another. It stands for the freedom of the workers of all nations; and, in so standing, it makes for the full freedom of all humanity.

III.

The socialist movement owes its birth and growth to that economic development or world-process which is rapidly separating a working or producing class from a possessing or capitalist class. The class that produces nothing possesses labor's fruits, and the opportunities and enjoyments these fruits afford, while the class that does the world's real work has increasing economic uncertainty, and physical and intellectual misery, as its portion.

The fact that these two classes have not yet become fully conscious of their distinction from each other, the fact that the lines of division and interest may not yet be clearly drawn, does not change the fact of the class conflict.

This class struggle is due to the private ownership of the means of employment, or the tools of production. Wherever

and whenever man owned his own land and tools, and by them produced only the things which he used, economic independence was possible. But production, or the making of goods, has long since ceased to be individual. The labors of scores, or even thousands, enter into almost every article produced. Production is now social or collective. Practically everything is made or done by many men—sometimes separated by seas or continents—working together for the same end. But this co-operation in production is not for the direct use of the things made by the workers who make them, but for the profit of the owners of the tools and means of production; and to this is due the present division of society into two distinct classes; and from it has sprung all the miseries, inharmonies and contradictions of our civilization.

Between these two classes there can be no possible compromise or identity of interest, any more than there can be peace in the midst of war, or light in the midst of darkness. A society based upon this class division carries in itself the seeds of its own destruction. Such a society is founded in fundamental injustice. There can be no possible basis for social peace, for individual freedom, for mental and moral harmony, except in the conscious and complete triumph of the working class as the only class that has the right or power to be.

IV.

The socialist program is not a theory imposed upon society for its acceptance or rejection. It is but the interpretation of what is, sooner or later, inevitable. Capitalism is already struggling to its destruction. It is no longer competent to organize or administer the work of the world, or even to preserve itself. The captains of industry are appalled at their own inability to control or direct the rapidly socializing forces of industry. The so-called trust is but a sign and form of this developing socialization of the world's work. The universal increase of the uncertainty of employment, the universal capitalist determination to break down the unity of labor in the trades unions, the widespread apprehensions of impending change, reveal that the institutions of capitalist society are passing under the power of inhering forces that will soon destroy them.

Into the midst of this strain and crisis of civilization, the socialist movement comes as the only saving or conservative force. If the world is to be saved from chaos, from universal disorder and misery, it must be by the union of the workers of all nations in the socialist movement. The socialist party comes with the only proposition or program for intelligently and deliberately organizing the nation for the common good of all its citizens. It is the first time that the mind of man has ever been directed toward the conscious organization of society.

Socialism means that all those things upon which the people in common depend shall be by the people in common be owned and administered. It means that the tools of employment shall belong to their creators and users; that all production shall be for the direct use of the producers; that the making of goods for

profit shall come to an end; that we shall all be workers together, and that opportunities shall be open and equal to all men.

V.

To the end that the workers may seize every possible advantage that may strengthen them to gain complete control of the powers of government, and thereby the sooner establish the co-operative commonwealth, the Socialist Party pledges itself to watch and work in both the economic and the political struggle for each successive immediate interest of the working class, for shortened days of labor and increases of wages; for the insurance of the workers against accident, sickness and lack of employment; for pensions for aged and exhausted workers; for the public ownership of the means of transportation, communication and exchange; for the graduated taxation of incomes, inheritances, and of franchise and land values, the proceeds to be applied to the public employment and bettering the conditions of the worker's children, and their freedom from the workshop; for the equal suffrage of men and women; for the prevention of the use of the military against labor in the settlement of strikes; for the free administration of justice; for popular government, including initiative, referendum, proportional representation, and the recall of officers by their constituents; and for every gain or advantage for the workers that may be wrested from the capitalist system, and that may relieve the suffering and strengthen the hands of labor. We lay upon every man elected to any executive or legislative office the first duty of striving to procure whatever is for the workers' most immediate interest, and for whatever will lessen the economic and political powers of the capitalist and increase the like powers of the worker.

But, in so doing, we are using these remedial measures as means to the one great end of the co-operative commonwealth. Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole powers of government, in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry, and thus come into their rightful inheritance.

To this end we pledge ourselves, as the party of the working class, to use all political power, as fast as it shall be entrusted to us by our fellow-workers, both for their immediate interests and for their ultimate and complete emancipation. To this end we appeal to all the workers of America, and to all who will lend their lives to the service of the workers in their struggle to gain their own, and to all who will nobly and disinterestedly give their days and energies unto the workers' cause, to cast their lot and faith with the Socialist Party. Our appeal for the trust and suffrages of our fellow-workers is at once an appeal for their common good and freedom, and for the freedom and blossoming of our common humanity. In pledging ourselves, and those which we represent to be faithful to the appeal which we make, we believe that we are but preparing the soil of the economic freedom from which will spring the freedom of the whole man.

FOR THE DAWN OF A BETTER DAY!

The Workers all over the World are Banded Together
in the International Social-Democratic Movement.
If you are interested in the subject you will get the
whole situation and all the arguments in the most
representative Socialist paper in the United States, the

Social-Democratic Herald

FREDERIC HEATH, Editor.

Which presents each week Special signed contribu-
tions from the pens of

VICTOR L. BERGER

— **AND** —

EUGENE V. DEBS,

And a host of the best Socialists on both sides of
the Atlantic.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

12 Months,	- - - - -	50 cents.
6 Months,	- - - - -	25 cents.
10 Weeks,	- - - - -	10 cents.

Remittances should be made to the

Social-Democratic Publishing Co.

344 SIXTH STREET.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Books on International Socialism

Avelling, Edward. The Students Marx.....	\$1.00
Berger, Victor L. What Shall We Do to be Saved. 2c, per 100 ..	.50
Bax, E. Belfort. The Ethics of Socialism.....	1.00
Story of the French Revolution.....	1.00
The Religion of Socialism.....	1.00
Benson, Allan L. Confessions of Capitalism.....	.05
Socialism Made Plain.....	10 cents. By mail .15
Bernstein, Edward. Ferdinand Lasalle.....	1.00
Blatchford, Rob't. Britain for the British.....	.25
Merrie England	.10
Brown, W. I. Open Letter from a Catholic to Pope Leo XIII ..	.02
Carpenter, Edward. England's Ideal.....	1.00
Civilization, Its Cause and Cure.....	1.00
Debs, Eugene V. Liberty.....	.10
Prison Labor	.05
DeVillie Gabriel. State and Socialism	.10
Dawson, W. H. Bismarck and State Socialism.....	1.00
German Socialism and Lasalle	1.00
Engels, Frederick. Conditions of the English Working Class	
in 1844	1.25
The Origin of the Family.....	.50
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific.....	.50
The same in paper.....	.10
Heath, Frederic. Socialism in America.....	.50
Kautsky, Karl. Life of Frederick Engels.....	.10
The Social Revolution	.50
La Fargue, Paul. The Evolution of Property.....	1.00
Liebknecht, Wilhelm. No Compromise.....	.10
Memoirs of Karl Marx.....	.50
Socialism, What it is, and What it Seeks to Ac-	
complish	.10
Loria, Achille. The Economic Foundations of Society.....	1.25
Marx, Karl. Capital. Cloth, 847 pages.....	2.00
Revolution and Counter-Revolution	1.00
Wage Labor and Capital.....	.05
Marx and Engels. The Communist Manifesto.....	.10
Massart and Vandervelde. Parasitism, Organic and Social..	1.00
Morris and Bax. Socialism, Its Growth and Outcome.....	1.25
Plato. The Republic. Book I.....	.15
The same. Book II.....	.15
The same. Book III.....	.15
Rodbertus, Karl. Over-production and Crises	1.00
Rogers, J. E Thorold. Work and Wages.....	1.00
Schaeffle, Dr The Quintessence of Socialism.....	1.00
Simons, A. M. The American Farmer.....	.50
Sombart, Werner. Socialism and the Social Movement in	
the 19th Century	1.00
Vail, Charles H. The Socialis* Movement.....	.10
Vandervelde, Emile. Collectivism and Industrial Evolution ..	.25
Wilshire, H. Gaylord. Trusts and Imperialism.....	.05

Send for complete catalogue of socialist books, free for the asking.

**THE VANGUARD, 344 Sixth Street,
MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN.**